



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,323	12/28/2000	Amnon Ribak	6727/0I110	9164

7590                    09/15/2003

DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
805 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
[REDACTED]	2174

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/751,323	RIBAK, AMNON
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33,36-74 and 77-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 34,35,75 and 76 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                     | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 18-33, 44, 45, 50-52, and 59-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Obradovich et al. (“Obradovich”, US 6,330,497).

As per independent claim 1, Obradovich teaches a display system for use in a vehicle, comprising:

a dashboard display, positioned in front of a driver of the vehicle, and adapted to display graphic user interface elements, in a predetermined graphic composition, providing information to the driver regarding operation of devices in the vehicle (fig. 2; col. 5, line 32 – col. 6, line 9); and

a processor, coupled to receive signals from the devices in the vehicle and to drive the display responsive thereto, and to alter the graphic composition of the display responsive to a selected input to the processor (col. 5, lines 39-52).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Obradovich teaches the graphic user interface elements provide information regarding at least one device selected from the group

consisting of speedometer, tachometer, audio equipment, air conditioner, Internet browser, television, GPS, sun roof, windows, seat positioning, cellular telephone, fuel gauge, oil level gauge, tire pressure gauge, engine temperature gauge, brake temperature gauge, window-washer fluid gauge, and headlights (col. 5, lines 45-52).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Obradovich teaches the input to the processor comprises a driver input provided by a driver of the vehicle (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 14 and col. 6, line 55).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Obradovich teaches the driver input comprises a vocal input (col. 6, lines 56-61).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Obradovich teaches the driver input comprises selection of an image, icon or button on the dashboard display, or selection of an item from a pull-down menu on the dashboard display (fig. 9 – fig. 18).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 7, Obradovich teaches the driver input is selected from the group consisting of a request to initiate a telephone call, a request to change the internal temperature of the vehicle, a request to utilize the GPA, and a request to adjust the audio equipment (fig. 1).

As per claims 19 and 20, which are dependent on claim 1 and 19 respectively, Obradovich teaches the input to the processor comprises an input from a gauge of vehicle performance wherein said gauge of vehicle performance comprises a gauge selected from the group consisting of speedometer, tachometer, fuel gauge, oil level gauge, tire pressure gauge, engine temperature gauge, brake temperature gauge, window washer fluid gauge (fig. 12 and 13).

As per claims 21 and 22, which are dependent on claims 1 and 21 respectively, Obradovich teaches the input to the processor comprises an input from a monitor of a status of vehicle components wherein said monitor of vehicle components monitors the status of a component selected from the group consisting of sun roof, windows, seat, internal rear-view mirror, external mirror, steering column, seat belt, door (108 of fig. 1; col. 7, line 12 – col. 8, line 34).

As per claims 23 and 24, which is dependent on claims 1 and 23 respectively, Obradovich teaches the input to the processor comprises an input from an auxiliary device in the vehicle wherein said auxiliary device is selected from the group consisting of audio equipment, air conditioner, Internet browser, television, e-mail terminal, GPS, cellular telephone, travel log, pager and personal digital assistant (PDA) (106 of fig. 1; col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 29).

As per claims 25 and 26, which are dependent on claims 1 and 25 respectively, Obradovich teaches the input to the processor is generated responsive to an electronic signal from a source external to the vehicle wherein said external electronic signal is generated due to

an event selected from the group consisting of receipt of an incoming telephone call, receipt of an e-mail message, download of a digital music recording, and receipt of a traffic alert (*106* of fig. 1; col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 29).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 1, Obradovich teaches the dashboard display is personally configured for an individual driver (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, Obradovich teaches the display is personally configured responsive to an input to the processor of driver preferences regarding the graphic composition of the dashboard display (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 27, Obradovich teaches the display is personally configured responsive to an input to the processor of driver preferences relating to operation of the dashboard display (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, Obradovich teaches the display is personally configured responsive to an input to the processor of driver preferences relating to operation of at least one device in the vehicle (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, Obradovich teaches the display is personally configured responsive to an input of driver preferences to the processor at a location remote from the vehicle (col. 19, lines 35-57).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 27, Obradovich teaches the display is personally configured responsive to an input of driver preferences to the processor within the vehicle (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32, Obradovich teaches the input of driver preferences comprises an input to the processor while the vehicle is driving (col. 18, lines 14-33).

As per independent claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 45, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 51, which is dependent on claim 50, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 52, which is dependent on claim 50, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 59, which is dependent on claim 50, it is a similar scope to claim 18; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 60, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 19; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 61, which is dependent on claim 60, it is a similar scope to claim 20; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 62, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 21; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 63, which is dependent on claim 62, it is a similar scope to claim 22; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 64, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 23; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 65, which is dependent on claim 64, it is a similar scope to claim 24; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 66, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 25; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 67, which is dependent on claim 66, it is a similar scope to claim 26; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 68, which is dependent on claim 44, it is a similar scope to claim 27; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 69, which is dependent on claim 68, it is a similar scope to claim 28; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 70, which is dependent on claim 68, it is a similar scope to claim 29; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 71, which is dependent on claim 68, it is a similar scope to claim 30; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 72, which is dependent on claim 68, it is a similar scope to claim 31; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 73, which is dependent on claim 68, it is a similar scope to claim 32; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 74, which is dependent on claim 73, it is a similar scope to claim 33; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 3-6 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich.

As per claims 3-6, which are all dependent on claim 1, the Examiner takes Official Notice that altering the graphic composition of the display by adding, removing, changing position, and changing size of a graphic user interface element on the display is obvious in the computer GUI art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify Obradovich's system to include altering the graphic composition of the display by adding, removing, changing position, and changing size of a graphic user interface element on the display since it would provide the user a better tool to organize the graphic composition on the display.

As per claims 46-49, which are all dependent on claim 44, they are similar in scope to claims 3-6 respectively; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 10-17, 36-43, 53-58, and 77-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Opel (US 5,555,502).

As per claims 10 and 11, which are dependent on claims 7 and 10 respectively, Obradovich does not disclose the vehicle also comprises driver-manipulable steering apparatus, said display system further comprising a selecting device mounted upon said steering apparatus, for use by a driver of the vehicle in providing said driver input wherein said selecting device comprises a pointing device. Opel discloses a pointing device mounted upon a steering wheel for use by a driver of the vehicle in providing the driver input (fig. 1 and fig. 2). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Opel of implementing a pointing device mounted upon a steering wheel for use by a driver of the vehicle in providing the driver input in Obradovich's system since it would allow a driver easily and safely interacting with the graphic display.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Opel teaches the pointing device is a thumb-button (fig. 2).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Opel teaches the selecting device also comprises clickable buttons located upon said steering apparatus (fig. 2).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, Opel teaches the selecting device also comprises clickable buttons located upon said pointing device (fig. 2).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 10, Opel teaches the steering apparatus comprises a steering wheel (fig. 1).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 10, Opel teaches the steering apparatus comprises handlebars (fig. 1).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 10, Opel teaches inputting said driver input to said processor does not require the driver removing a hand from the steering apparatus (fig. 1; because the selecting device is mounted upon the steering wheel, the driver does not require removing a hand from the steering wheel to input data).

Claims 36, 43, 77, and 81 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 10.

Claim 53 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Claims 37, 53, and 54 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

Claims 38, 55, and 78 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 12.

Claims 39, 56, and 79 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Claims 40, 57, and 80 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 14.

Claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Claim 42 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16.

Claim 58 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 34, 35, 75, and 76 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5691695 A to Lahiff, John E. discloses vehicle information display on steering wheel surface.

US 5666102 A to Lahiff, John E. discloses vehicle signals incorporated into steering wheel rim.

***Inquiries***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen  
September 4, 2003

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100